1	Brian C. Rocca, Bar No. 221576 brian.rocca@morganlewis.com	Glenn D. Pomerantz, Bar No. 112503 glenn.pomerantz@mto.com
2	Sujal J. Shah, Bar No. 215230 sujal.shah@morganlewis.com	Kuruvilla Olasa, Bar No. 281509 kuruvilla.olasa@mto.com
3	Michelle Park Chiu, Bar No. 248421 michelle.chiu@morganlewis.com	MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP 350 South Grand Avenue, Fiftieth Floor
4	Minna Lo Naranjo, Bar No. 259005	Los Angeles, California 90071
5	minna.naranjo@morganlewis.com Rishi P. Satia, Bar No. 301958	Telephone: (213) 683-9100
6	rishi.satia@morganlewis.com MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP	Kyle W. Mach, Bar No. 282090 kyle.mach@mto.com
7	One Market, Spear Street Tower San Francisco, CA 94105	Justin P. Raphael, Bar No. 292380 justin.raphael@mto.com
8	Telephone: (415) 442-1000	Emily C. Curran-Huberty, Bar No. 293065 emily.curran-huberty@mto.com
	Richard S. Taffet, pro hac vice richard.taffet@morganlewis.com	MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP 560 Mission Street, Twenty Seventh Fl.
9	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP	San Francisco, California 94105
10	101 Park Avenue New York, NY 10178	Telephone: (415) 512-4000
11	Telephone: (212) 309-6000	Jonathan I. Kravis, <i>pro hac vice</i> jonathan.kravis@mto.com
12	Counsel for Defendants	MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP 601 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Ste 500E
13		Washington, D.C. 20001 Telephone: (202) 220-1100
14		• , ,
15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
16		
17		
18	IN RE GOOGLE PLAY STORE	Case No. 3:21-md-02981-JD
19	ANTITRUST LITIGATION	Case 110. 5.21-1114-02/01-1D
20		
20	THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:	DECLARATION OF GENARO LOPEZ
	Epic Games, Inc. v. Google LLC et al., Case No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD	DECLARATION OF GENARO LOPEZ IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS'
202122	Epic Games, Inc. v. Google LLC et al., Case	DECLARATION OF GENARO LOPEZ
21	Epic Games, Inc. v. Google LLC et al., Case No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD Match Group, LLC et al. v. Google LLC et al., Case No. 3:22-cv-02746-JD In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust	DECLARATION OF GENARO LOPEZ IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' REPLY TO PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSES
21 22	Epic Games, Inc. v. Google LLC et al., Case No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD Match Group, LLC et al. v. Google LLC et al., Case No. 3:22-cv-02746-JD In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust Litigation, Case No. 3:20-cv-05761-JD State of Utah et al v. Google LLC et al., Case	DECLARATION OF GENARO LOPEZ IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' REPLY TO PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSES TO MINUTE ORDER QUESTIONS
21 22 23 24	Epic Games, Inc. v. Google LLC et al., Case No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD Match Group, LLC et al. v. Google LLC et al., Case No. 3:22-cv-02746-JD In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust Litigation, Case No. 3:20-cv-05761-JD	DECLARATION OF GENARO LOPEZ IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' REPLY TO PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSES TO MINUTE ORDER QUESTIONS
21 22 23 24 25	Epic Games, Inc. v. Google LLC et al., Case No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD Match Group, LLC et al. v. Google LLC et al., Case No. 3:22-cv-02746-JD In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust Litigation, Case No. 3:20-cv-05761-JD State of Utah et al v. Google LLC et al., Case	DECLARATION OF GENARO LOPEZ IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' REPLY TO PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSES TO MINUTE ORDER QUESTIONS
21 22 23 24	Epic Games, Inc. v. Google LLC et al., Case No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD Match Group, LLC et al. v. Google LLC et al., Case No. 3:22-cv-02746-JD In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust Litigation, Case No. 3:20-cv-05761-JD State of Utah et al v. Google LLC et al., Case	DECLARATION OF GENARO LOPEZ IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' REPLY TO PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSES TO MINUTE ORDER QUESTIONS Judge: Hon. James Donato

28

- 1. I am currently the Information Governance Lead for Defendant Google, LLC (along with Google-affiliated entities, "Google"). I have been employed by Google since October 2019 and have held my current position since the beginning of my employment. Over the course of my employment at Google, I have acquired personal knowledge of Google's practices and procedures concerning information governance programs to ensure that Google appropriately manages the information that it maintains and uses for business operations.
- 2. I have reviewed the portion of Plaintiffs' January 24, 2023 filing that says that the following statement in a November 11, 2021 letter from Google to Plaintiffs is inaccurate: "With respect to the technological processes required to be taken by individuals to preserve chats or instant messages following their receipt of litigation holds, Google responds that the technological settings on Google's chat retention policy (see Exhibit A) did not change, as Google does not have the ability to change default settings for individual custodians with respect to the chat history setting. See Exhibit B, Google Workspace Admin Help page re: chat history. Specifically:
 - i. Google's default settings for chat history for the entire organization is set to off:
 - ii. Google employees need to apply the "history on" setting on a chat-by-chat basis; and
 - iii. Settings for chat history are set by each individual custodian."
- 3. I have also read that Plaintiffs point to my testimony at the January 12, 2023 hearing to suggest that I agree that the November 11, 2021 statement is inaccurate. Plaintiffs are incorrect, as I believe the above November 11, 2021 statement is accurate. Neither the Google Chat product nor Google's legal hold tool, Vault, have functionality that would allow Google to change default history settings on an individual-by-individual basis.
- 4. Consistent with my testimony provided on January 12, 2023, there are organizational units or groups, to which users can be added and default history can be changed at a group level. To the best of my knowledge, Google does not use, and has never used these

groups for chat preservation. And, consistent with my testimony, these groups have limitations and drawbacks. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on this 26th day of January 2023 in San Francisco. DocuSigned by: Genaro Lopez